

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/673,093
Response to Restriction Requirement dated April 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 24 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner is requesting that the applicant restrict this application to one of the five inventions as follows:

- I. Claims 1-40 and 56-60, drawn to a method of selecting at least one performance property and at least one homogeneous interaction parameter.
- II. Claims 41-55, drawn to a method of selecting at least one probe particulate material derived from an interfacial potential property.
- III. Claims 61-77, 109-113, and 130-132, drawn to a method of selecting at least two performance properties and at least one homogeneous interaction parameter.
- IV. Claims 78-82, drawn to a method of selecting at least one performance property of two or more compositions and at least one homogeneous interaction parameter.
- V. Claims 83-108, 114-129, and 133-134, drawn to methods of performance mapping.

To be responsive, the applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, directed to claims 1-40 and 56-60 for examination.

For the following reasons, the restriction requirement is respectfully traversed.


With regard to all of the claims, it is respectfully submitted that all claims should be examined at this time since there appears to be no serious burden on the part of the Examiner to search the entire scope of the claims. This is especially true considering that Groups I, III, and IV each have the same class and subclass, thus reflecting that the searches will certainly overlap. Furthermore, the subject matter of Group I and Group III are quite similar and recite similar steps, including the performance property. At a minimum, the Examiner should include the subject matter of Group III with the subject matter of Group I due to these overlapping similarities. It is believed that the subject matter has the same concept from the standpoint that the searches will overlap in

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/673,093
Response to Restriction Requirement dated April 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2007

part. Under M.P.E.P. § 803, if there is no serious burden in the examination of all of the claims even if the claims are directed to separate inventions, the Examiner must examine all claims at this time. It would appear that § 803 applies to the current situation and therefore the restriction requirement should be withdrawn and all claims should be examined at this time.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 03-0060. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and should also be charged to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Luke A. Kilyk
Reg. No. 33,251

Attorney Docket No. 03073CIP (3600-374-06)
KILYK & BOWERSOX, P.L.L.C.
400 Holiday Court, Suite 102
Warrenton, VA 20186
Tel.: (540) 428-1701
Fax: (540) 428-1720